DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 744 CG 009 810

AUTHOR Seiferth, Berniece
TITLE Juvenile Delinquency.
PUB DATE [65]
NOTE 34p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *Delinquency; *Delinquency Prevention; Literature Reviews; Prevention; Program Descriptions; *Social Problems; State of the Art Reviews; *Statistical Data

ABSTRACT

The author discusses juvenile delinquency in an attempt to understand its growth and the trends it has taken in the United States during the 20th century. He gives careful consideration to the study, "Unraveling Delinquency", written by the Gluecks in 1950, one of the most comprehensive in this entire area. Results from more recent studies indicate that the problem may be more evenly distributed in the various socio-economic strata than has been previously thought. The many treatment programs provided for juvenile offenders are described, as is the importance of preventative measures. The author argues that it is time for the public to stop throwing brickbats at the younger generation and begin, rather, laying the bricks that will provide the solid foundation for a bulwark of prevention. (PC)

ED106744

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Berniece Seiferth

Southern Illinois University

Associate Professor

Doctor of Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CG009820

"In delinquency we are dealing not with predestination but with destination."—Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck

Almost without exception every book written about the subject of juvenile delinquency begins by saying that juvenile delinquency is one of the most pressing problems of the time because of the rapidity with which it is increasing. And so in order to conform to this universal pattern, and because both of the foregoing statements appear to be true, this author shall follow suit and begin in an identical manner. However, the chapter was undertaken originally as a discussion of one of the major problems facing the world today in which young people are involved, but as the research progressed on the subject, the point of emphasis began to change. It is not anticipated that many students who are juvenile delinquents or potential ones will study this material. However, research by psychiatrists, social workers, medical men, and law enforcement officers points out that delinquency more often than not results from conditions existing in the home. Therefore, this is being written in the hope that future parents will read, study, and become aware that much of their own children's behaviour will reflect the training and assurance received from the parents. It also is hoped that these students will, in turn, do all that is within their power to break this chain of juvenile delinquency that appears to be sweeping our country. It certainly is not too early to begin training to be good parents, and that seems to be the focal point for stemming the tide of delinquency that is besetting the United States today.

Concern over juvenile delinquency certainly is nothing new, for

adults have been worrying over this for thousands of years. Listen to what an Egyptian priest 4000 years ago had to say: "Youth is disintegrating. The youngsters of the land have a disrespect for their elders, and a contempt for authority in every form. Vandalism is rife, and crime of all kinds is rampant among our young people. The nation is in peril!" Still another Egyptian tablet written in hieroglyphics read: "The times are out of joint, children do not obey their elders, and everyone writes a book." Conditions had not improved much in 1500 years when Socrates, the Greek philosopher said: "Children today love luxury. They have bad manners, a contempt for authority, a disrespect for their elders, and they like to talk instead of work. They contradict their parents, chatter before company, gobble up the best at the table, and tyrannize over their teachers." But even these dire warnings did not seem to eliminate all misbehavior of the youth. In Philadelphia in 1764 a clergyman, the Reverend Henry M. Mhulenberg, reported that the boys were extremely noisy during his preaching and further complained: "It is really dreadful in this large city, teeming with young folks of all nationalities, who are permitted all freedom, (and) no discipline. The laws are too lenient. It's like trying to check horses with silken threads."

Still later in 1830, Archer B. Hulbert wrote an article in which he stated that things had reached a state in this country wherein "half the number of persons actually convicted of crime were youths who had not yet reached the age of discretion."[1]

One hundred years ago New York, just as it is today, was troubled by gangs known by such names as the Plug Uglies, Roach Guards, Swamp Angels, Slaughter Housers, Dead Rabbits and Forty Thieves. Today,

similar gangs are known as the Dukes, Viceroys, Egyptian Kings, Crusaders, Templars and Astoria Gents. Surprisingly enough, the reasons given for much of the aberrant behavior in past history are about the same as those given today. Negley Teeters and David Matza have said: "It has always been popular for each generation to believe its children were the worst, the most lawless and the most unruly."[2] Even though this may be true, it is not enough for us to shrug off the rising rates of delinquency among both boys and girls by some time worn excuses that boys will be boys, or that all young people must sow their wild oats sometime. The type of delinquent acts being committed today are not the acts of fun or even just irresponsible behavior; as will be shown later in this paper.

Nor should our sensibilities to the danger of juvenile delinquency be lulled simply because this is a world wide problem and not one simply indigenous to the United States. This in no wise minimizes the significance or inherent dangers in the problem, but it must be met and worked at by all the social agencies that can be brought to bear in order to preserve our society. It is true that delinquency figures are rising all over the world. England has its "Teddy boys", so named because they have adopted the Edwardian style of dress. "The Teddy boy movement is mixed with an ugly streak of violence and general hostility towards society which often overlapped with actual criminality," according to T. R. Fyvel.[3] The counterpart of the Teddy boys in France are called "blousons noirs," meaning black jackets. In Germany, they are called "Halbstarken," the "half-strong," and in Sweden, their name is "Skinnknutte Raggare," or "leather-jackets." In Sweden 3 per cent of all the teen-age youth go through

the courts for misdemeanors of some kind. In Japan, the "taiyozoku," thunder boys, or children of the sun, commit 21 per cent of all that country's crime compared to the 12 per cent which is committed by teen-agers in the United States. In another comparison, the juveniles account for 19 per cent of the total rapes in the United States, but in Japan, they commit 52 per cent of all rapes. The Australians call their teen-age delinquents "bodgies," the girls are called "widgies" and in Italy the youthful gangs are called "vitelloni" or fat calves. The Soviets refer to their delinquents as "stilyagi" or style boys. However, from the Soviet Union there has been no official recognition of a problem, and no statistics have been released about the amount of crime committed, but there have been increasing numbers of references to it in their newspapers.

The terms delinquency (delinquere) and juvenile (juvenilis) are ancient ones dating back to the time of the early Romans. Delinquency referred to failure or a neglect of duty and an abandoment of an agreement. However, the term, "juvenile delinquency" as is used today is only a little over a hundred years old. "The first definite record of its use was in the 1820's when the Society for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency was formed in New York City. In 1703, when Pope Clement XI established the Hospice of San Micheles in Rome (the first institution specifically for the corrective treatment of wayward youth), the word for 'wicked' rather than 'delinquent' was used in the motto over its door."[4]

Before proceding any further, it would appear necessary to define the meaning of the term, juvenile delinquent. There are just about as many definitions as there are people writing about the subject, but

let us look at these in order to arrive at a workable definition. Two medical doctors, Dr. Tait and Dr. Hodges, Jr., said: "Like others before us, we view delinquency as a social phenomenon, namely an antisocial act involving interaction between an individual and society. A youngster within the age limits prescribed in the involved community who has come to the attention of the juvenile court, police, or other duly constituted authority for an act(s) considered a "delinquency" by the laws of that community."[5] They are saying, in effect, that a delinquent is a child who has become known to the police or the court for an act legally defined as a "delinquency" by the particular community in which the offender resides. Another authority, Herbert C. Quay, Research Director of the Children's Research Center at the University of Illinois, declared that a juvenile offender is decided by conditions that vary as to age, sex, and acts considered delinquent. He further defines a delinquent as one "whose behavior is a relatively serious legal offense, which is inappropriate to his level of development; is not committed as a result of extremely low intellect, intracranial organic pathology, or severe mental or metabolic dysfunction; and is alien to the culture in which he has been reared. Whether or not the individual is apprehended or legally adjudicated is not crucial."[6]

Still other experts in the field, Doctors Sheldon and Eleanor Gluack, defined delinquency as follows: "Delinquency refers to repeated acts of a kind which when committed by persons beyond the statutory juvenile court age of 16 are punishable as crimes (either felonies or misdemeanors)—except for a few instances of persistent stubbornness, truancy, running away, associating with immoral persons,

and the like. Children who once or twice during the period of growing up steal a toy in a ten-cent store, sneak into a subway or motion picture theatre, play hooky, and the like and soon outgrow such peccadilloes are not true delinquents even though they have violated the law."[7] In other words, it is necessary to have information that will distinguish between normal and healthy rowdiness and buoyancy from behavior pathology.

States differ as to deciding when a child has passed the juvenile category, and oftentimes the crime or nature of it is the deciding factor as to whether a child shall be tried as an adult or as a child. Illinois in 1899 was the first state to enact a juvenile-court law. Before that, all child offenders were technically considered criminals. "Hebraic law exempted the male child from sinning until his rite de passage of 13. Roman law divided minors into three categories with regard to responsibility; (a) children under 7 were not responsible under any circumstances; (b) those from 7 up to the age of puberty were not responsible if the praetor was of the opinion that they lacked understanding of the nature of their acts; and (c) those from puberty up to 25 years of age were to have their youthfulness taken into consideration in the prescribing of punishment. The influence of Roman law on the Napoleonic Code appeared in the latter's provision that limited responsibility was to be ascribed to children under 16, the age ceiling later being raised to 18," according to Milton L. Barron. He also explained that the English law qualified responsibility because of age long before the start of American society. Ever since the time of Edward III it was taken for granted in England that no child under 7 should be held responsible for a

crime, since he had not the understanding and judgment to stand guilty for such a crime. Barron further stated: "From three to 14 years of age the English child has been presumed to be incapable of guilt, and therefore irresponsible, unless there is evidence of understanding and judgment or the ability to discern between good and evil."[8]

Now let us consider the facts of juvenile delinquency and the reliability of such statistics. There are two major sources for such information; the Uniform Crime Reports, published annually by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Juvenile Court Statistics, published annually by the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Since the information given to the Federal Bureau of Investigation is on a purely voluntary basis, some people in the past have criticized these as being inadequate, but in 1963, agencies servicing 92 per cent of the United States population reported their arrest data, so that would seem to be quite representative. The Juvenile Court Statistics are arrived at in a different manner; they are collected on a sample basis. In 1962, the Children's Bureau collected records from 502 juvenile courts in the United States and projected its figures from this sampling. In 1963, one and two tenths million juveniles under 18 were arrested in our nation and these figures do not include traffic violations unless the juvenile was charged with driving while intoxicated. The chief crime was assault against property, with larceny and burglary ranking next. Sensational crimes, such as sex offenses, narcotics violations, and offenses against the person actually account for less than 8 per cent of all juvenile offenses. Traditionally, the rural areas have always

shown less crime by juveniles than the urban areas but in 1963, it was just under 5 per cent. However, it has been increasing in the rural areas since 1944, just as it has in the cities. It is well to remember also that only about 18 million rural people out of a total of 57 million who live on farms are covered by the report, so the total of involved youth could be 3 or 4 times the amount, according to some researchers.

In 1962, there were 555,000 juvenile court cases and in all probability, some of these offenders were hailed into court more than once. Even so, one authority felt that 480,000 different delinquents were in court, or 2 per cent of all our population, aged 10 to 17 years. Negroes account for a higher proportion of these delinquents than their ratio in society would normally be. About 70 per cent of all arrests in 1963 were made of white offenders and 25 per cent Negro, but only 10 per cent of our population is Negro. This fact has special significance for all who would like to eradicate the causes of delinquency.

Crime surveys report that more than 40 per cent of the major crimes and almost 23 per cent of all auto thefts are committed by persons under 18; and nearly one half of these are by persons under 15. The 1962 reports reveal an alarming increase of 9 per cent in arrests as compared with 1961. A few years earlier the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Committee conducted a study for the years 1940 to 1959 and also did a preliminary study for 1960. This revealed an alarming change in the patterns in juvenile delinquency. No longer was it confined to the slum areas of the cities but it was rising by 7 per cent in the white collar suburbs and 15 per cent in the rural

areas. They concluded that delinquency is rising at a rate greater than the rate of growth of population. The trend so far does not appear as great for the very young, those under 15, as it does for those 15 to 21.

It is true that no set of statistics will give the complete and clear picture. Some of the reasons are that arrests vary according to communities; some problems are handled by referral to some other agency; in some cities where there is a juvenile court, cases may increase, and often children from richer suburbs or certain privileged areas are not arrested as frequently as children in poorer parts of town. It also appears true that boys are treated more seriously for offenses than are girls. Girls in more recent years have shown more conflict with their families than have boys, and arrests for larceny and other conventional offenses by girls under 18 increased in 1960, according to the Uniform Crime Reports.

In an article in the Journal of Negro Education, Negley K. Teeters and David Matya indicated that the arguments of the academic criminologists against a view that delinquency is increasing may be summarized as follows: "(1) The growth in child population offsets the increase in delinquency; (2) there is more delinquency as more acts become defined as delinquency, and urban society becomes more formalized, and (3) the increase is a reflection of improved techniques of apprehension."[9] But even those arguments are insufficient to refute the fact that from 1952 to 1956, the increase was 54 per cent without an adjustment for population increase in the 10 to 17 years age span and a 48 per cent increase if the population increase is taken into consideration. It is extremely difficult to

argue with those figures.

It would be well at this point to read what some of our writers have to say about the rising roles of juvenile delinquents. In "the Reporter" for the 20th of August, 1959, Miss Virginia Held put it this way; "There has probably never been a moment in hisotry when adults were not shocked by what they regarded as an unprecedented wave of bad behaviour among children and adolescents. But in our time reports of gang warfare in the streets, teenage muggings, and senseless killings have turned shock to cold fear. Juvenile delinquency, particularly in the United States, has come to be considered one of the most urgent social problems of the day, and the epidemic of arrogance and crime seems to be spreading so fast that it obliterates the best efforts society can make to control it—or even to understand it."

And Mr. Douglass M. Allen, Associate Editor of Newsweek, wrote these words in the 14th of September 1959 issue: "And what they say is that sizable areas of the world's foremost metropolis are splintered into feudal enclaves, run in effect by gangs of ruthless, amoral teenagers....Between them, they rule over the slums and drab housing projects of Harlem and the Lower East Side; the Bronx; the Bedford-Stuyvesant and Navy Yard districts of Brooklyn; and South Jamaica and Ozone Park, in Queens. They reign by terror, and strangers enter their demesnes after nightfall at their peril. Some of the gangs are bigger and more powerful than others, with 250 to 300 members; some have alliances; they can field a battle order of 1,000 troops or more."

Let us turn our attention now to the causes of juvenile delinquency. Immediately, we must be on our guard lest we attempt to

arrive at the too simple or too obvious answers. Many studies have shown that there is no single cause of juvenile delinquency or of adult crime. Oftentimes a number of factors occur together in a situation, and the combination of these relate and and bring about deviant behavior. Some of the factors affecting youthful crime are as follows: personality factors, including biological, mental and emotional conditions and character and behavior traits; home and family relations, especially broken homes; inadequate or maladjusted families; companionship relationships and gang activities; the influence of community institutions and agencies, especially the deleterious effects of certain types of amusements; population factors; economic and physical environmental factors, especially poverty, unemployment, slums, etc.; and inadequate controls, law observance and enforcement and treatment of offenders, as listed by one authority.

The classic study in unraveling delinquency which also bears that title, Unraveling Delinquency, written by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck in 1950, is perhaps one of the most comprehensive in this entire area. The Gluecks, from 1940 to 1948, worked in an underprivileged area in Boston under the auspices of the Harvard Law School. They worked with 500 delinquent boys and each was matched with another boy who was similar in intelligence, ethnic group, age, and neighborhood conditions. They emphasized that heretofore much of the previous research had a tendency to overemphasize a particular approach or cause for delinquency to the detriment of all others that might have been interacting also. They stated that some theorists feel that their ideas are the only correct ones, and they refuse to consider any other special fields of study that could also contribute to the understanding

of the entire problem of juvenile delinquency. It is best not to accept one area of science or method for dealing with the problem of juvenile delinquency.

If research into the causes of delinquency emphasizes the sociologic, or ecologic, or cultural, or psychiatric, or psychoanalytic, or anthropologic approach, relegating the others to a remote position, if not totally ignoring them, then we must immediately be on guard about the findings. The problems of human behavior involve the study of the individual and of society as it interacts with the individual, so it is felt by most impartial students of the problem of delinquency that several disciplines must be used in order to get at the root causes. If a researcher enters the field with only one idea in mind, that bias will weaken both the method of research and the interpretation of it. Therefore, the Gluecks were infinitely suited to such a study because they did not enter it with any predetermined bias or rationale which they attempted to prove.

To begin their research into the causes of delinquency, the Gluecks first set up a five-factor Social Prediction Table with the study to concentrate on the following factors: (1) affection of the mother for the boy; (2) affection of the father for the boy; (3) supervision of the boy by the mother; (4) discipline of the boy by the father; and (5) family cohesiveness. Later this scale was found to be unnecessary in its entirety and a 3 point scale was found to be equally effective. The new scale included the following factors: (1) Discipline of the boy by the mother or a mother substitute; (2) supervision of the boy by his mother; and (3) cohesiveness of the family unit. The average at the first appearance in a court for these

delinquent boys proved to be 12.4 years. In addition, one fourth appeared in court first when they were under the age of 11, 46 per cent appeared first at 11, 12 or 13 years of age. The average number of appearances was 3.6. One half of the 500 delinquents showed tendencies toward misbehavior before their 8th year, and two fifths before the age of 11. Overall, 88 per cent of the boys showed behavior problems before they reached puberty. The average age of the first known deviant behavior was 8.3 years. Of the non-delinquent 500 boys, one fourth had misbehaved prior to this study, but the acts had been of a minor nature or had only been committed once.

All of the 500 delinquents and the 500 non-delinquents used in the study lived in underprivileged urban areas. These were regions of considerable physical and moral deterioration and delinquency. In fact, 59 per cent of the delinquents and 54 per cent of the non-delinquents lived where the delinquency rate was 10-24.9 cases per thousand. Fully 20 per cent of the delinquents and 22 per cent of the non-delinquents came from regions where the crime rate was 25-49.9 per thousand; 15 per cent of the former and 17 per cent of the latter lived where the crime rate was 50-100 per thousand. One fourth of all boys were of English background, one fourth were Italian and one fifth were Irish. The average intelligence quotient of the delinquents was 92 and for the non-delinquents it was 94.

In studying the family backgrounds of these boys, some patterns of behavior began to be established about the parents. The parents of both groups had very little schooling with 2 out of 10 being illiterate and five out of ten having just finished grammar school. Four out of ten of the marriages of the parents of the delinquents had been

forced and three out of ten for the non-delinquents, so neither group of boys had started out too well as far as having parents who accepted family responsibility. Fully one half of the fathers of the delinquents had poor work habits and five times as many of their fathers had poor work habits as compared to the fathers of the non-delinquents. Other traits exhibited among the parents were defective intelligence, emotional disturbances, drunkenness and criminalism. In the findings, it was felt that family pride, the relationship of the parents toward each other and to their children and the standards of conduct set up by the home all entered into the behavior patterns of the young people.

At school the boys who became delinquent were less interested in learning, were inattentive, careless, lazy and usually retarded in their work. Both groups preferred manual arts and neither cared for mathematics, social studies, art, English, science, or foreign languages. Four out of ten of the delinquents and one out of ten of the non-delinquents were poor students, but significant differences did appear in their abstract intelligence, that is, of vocabulary, information and comprehension.

Other character traits discovered by the Gluecks were that the delinquents were far more socially defiant, far less submissive to authority, and more ambivalent to authority than the non-delinquents. They either were unwilling or unable to curb their natural inclination to self-indulgent behavior in line with the authoritative demands of the home, the school and the larger society. They also felt more frequently that they were not being recognized or appreciated and they had more feelings of resentment. They were less cooperative, they possessed more hostile impulses, were more suspicious, more destruc-

tive and were armed with exaggerated defensive attitudes toward life.

In order to preserve human potential for adult life, as well as time and money, it becomes quite apparent that some reliable device is necessary that will help pick out juvenile delinquents before they get into the wrong patterns of behavior. From the research done by the Gluecks, it would appear that the device they have formulated might help social workers or teachers spot potential delinquents at the early age of five or six, and it might also aid in delineating a true delinquent from a misbehaving child. Here again, one method of finding the delinquents should not be used to the exclusion of all others. For example, the study of environmental pressures is important, but one must realize that children respond to all matters differently. It is not living in a poor environment alone that causes a boy to go wrong. Rather, it is necessary to know, in addition, what all the experiences mean in terms of the development of the total personality and character of the child.

In physique the delinquents as a group were better coordinated than the non-delinquents, and that in itself may be important. Perhaps their better coordination enabled them to participate more in energetic behavior than a boy who had a slower method of physical development or some other problem.

While the research of the Gluecks lasted over a period of ten years and seems quite complete and exhaustive, other important research has been done also. However, all research is not profitable or useful, according to Roul Tunley. Mr. Tunley is not a sociologist, psychiatrist or social worker, but a reporter. He had no ax to grind nor any vested interest to protect in the study of juvenile delinquency.

He was hired by the public spirited members of the Greater Philadelphia Movement and spent a year and a half investigating causes on his own. In his book, Kids, Crime and Chaos, he tells about one research project that was done with absurd results. "One expensive survey analyzed small children for 'succorance and playmirth,' which simply means the youngsters' seeking of fun and companionship. After many months had passed, many dollars been spent and many tabulations made, the tremendous scientific conclusion was revealed like a thunderclap from Mount Sinnai: little boys like to play with little boys, and little girls with little girls!"[10]

Another author in the field, found that the homes of delinquents tend to be dirty, run down, have little sanitation, and are disorderly and cluttered. They also follow weak routines, the physical space is at a premium, and little opportunity is provided for the family as a whole. These families are more often disrupted by death, desertion, divorce or separation and are broken more frequently than the homes of the non-delinquents. Some people have erroneously inferred that working mothers are a chief cause of juvenile delinquency, but here again, other factors play an equal important part. Equally important are whether she provides adequate supervision for the child in her absence and the temperament of the child involved. More important were the relationships between the parents and the parents with the child, the affection of the parents, especially the father's attitudes, and the child's response to affection or his feeling of the lack of it. Discipline also was found to be important—and here seemingly three kinds are often responsible for misbehavior; if discipline is too lax, too severe or erratic. A close and affectionate

relationship with their parents was one of the features most often distinguishing non-delinquents from the delinquents. The non-delinquents also had parental discipline which was 'firm but kindly,' rather than lax, overstrict or erratic. In another followup study of the Gluecks, it was found that in delinquent homes, the parents quarreled more or rejected the child more, rather than the chief causes being a broken home or where the parents were of a criminal nature.[12]

Mrs. Katharine B. Oettinger, chief of the Children's Bureau, has said that it appeared that delinquency "could not be proved as resulting from poverty, poor housing or even lack of recreational facilities. Delinquency is more likely to increase in a time of prosperity than in a time of depression."

This can be supported by checking the files of many of our wealthiest suburbs. Recently, in New York's Westchester County, one of the wealthiest neighborhoods in the world, it was found that 151 of the youngsters there between the ages of 13 and 19 were taking heroin or marijuana. According to an article in the Saturday Evening Post, this was an area where more social activities had been organized, more public and private beaches had been provided, more swimming pools, golf courses, parks and other recreational facilities to keep the children out of mischief were present than in almost any other place in the country. Yet this problem "had invaded families which have given their children everything that money can buy, every opportunity that schools, churches, and social welfare can provide."[13]

"In a recent study by James F. Short, Jr., F. Ivan Nye and Virgil J. Olson who examined 2,350 high school boys and girls in half a dozen Western and Midwestern communities, they found, 'No significant diff-

erence in delinquent behavior in the different socio-economic strata.' Estimates of the extent of delinquent behavior in the general population indicate that the problem may be more evenly distributed in the various socio-economic strata than the official records lead one to believe," was the conclusion of the study.[13]

Tunley studied some of the more commonly accepted causes of delinquency and was able to refute rather effectively each one of them. Broken homes have often been called one of the worst offenders, but according to Tunley, the percentage of serious offenders from broken homes was less than the number from intact homes. However, a child from a broken home is more apt to be sent to a court and very often to an institution. "Putting all the blame at the door of the broken home is a neat, but too easy, way out," said Dr. William C. Kvaraceus, to the National Education Association. "Too often, it becomes a respectable, though tricky, way of psychologically dismissing the youngster who is difficult to diagnose and who needs help that cannot be easily prescribed."[14]

Another generally accepted reason for delinquency is that insufficient clubs or recreation is provided for the youngsters. But in an intensive study of a boys' club in New York, members were found to be more delinquent after joining than before. Again a Children's Bureau pamphlet stated: "Research indicates that providing additional recreation facilities in an area usually does not bring about significant changes in the volume of juvenile delinquency."[15]

Still another idea of eliminating delinquency proposed by some authorities is "to get the kids out of the cities into the open." But in 1958, the Children's Bureau reported: "The increase in delin-

quency is not limited to the large cities, as is so often supposed. On the contrary, the increase in 1958 was much greater in rural courts (11 per cent) than it was in the urban and semiurban courts (6 per cent).

Other causes can be noted. "A widespread conception of youth who commit violent and serious acts of delinquency is that they are neurotic, emotionally disturbed or in some way maladjusted," says Anthony Sorrentino, head of the Illinois Youth Commission's Chicago Area Project. "Such a conception is misleading and certainly not in accord with the knowledge available. Only a small percentage of adolescents who engage in delinquency are disturbed in the traditional psychological sense." He further believes that the incidence of delinquents who have "personality problems" is not likely to be greater than that found in other groups—in a club or on a football team, for example.[16 4]

Judge Reinemann, of Philadelphia's County Court, agrees with Sorrentino when he said: "Nothing is being gained by saying every delinquent is a sick child. You thus remove the child from a proper understanding of his problem. Psychiatry may be a useful treatment in no more than 10 per cent of the cases."[17 5] In the most recent report to the Congress, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare summed up its point of view as follows: "Several studies have attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of clinical treatment of delinquents. The results of these studies are inconclusive; they have proved neither its effectiveness nor ineffectiveness. A careful perusal of the literature of psychiatry, psychology, mental health, and the other so-called "helping professions" leaves one with the impression that the apparent

ineffectiveness of clinical intervention in the delinquency process is due either to the absence of appropriate conditions for therapautic contact, or the absence of needed health education, recreational or vocational services once such contact is established."[186]

Another whipping boy for delinquency is the schools. It is a proven fact that approximately one third of juveniles have no interest in college or school as it is now organized. Dr. Negley Teeters, criminologist of Temple University says: "And if you ask me, the crux of our delinquency is not the parents; it's the schools. Our schools are filled with misfits, kids who don't belong. Our education is geared for all our kids and that's the heart of the problem. We need some kind of program for the kids who don't fit into our school picture, who are not interested in middle class norms or in becoming a lawyer someday."[197]

Dr. William Kvaraceus, of Boston University, agreed with Dr. Teeters in feeling that our schools are in danger of becoming the most expensive irrelevancy of the 20th century. He also estimates that only about 35 per cent profit from the college preparatory curriculum in the schools as organized at present. Some authorities state that 2.5 per cent of our students have intelligence quotients that are lower than 20, that 25 per cent fall in the 70-90 group; 45 per cent have between 90-110; 25 per cent rank in the 110-130 and 2.5 per cent have an intelligence quotient of 130 or above. This plainly points out that there are about 30 per cent of our students in high school who need a particular type of instruction. Samuel Miller Brownell, former commissioner for the United States Office of Education, cites factors which enter into the failure to hold

children or which may contribute to delinquency: poor preparation of teachers in detection of special needs of children; lack of time to really know them; and failure of schools to provide assistance to deal with severe behavior problems. There appears to be a correlation between reading retardation and delinquency, and in one New York court, 75 per cent of the delinquents had reading difficulty. Many authorities feel that the effectiveness of all the counseling services offered, the social work, the psychological and attendance services will not amount to much until the schools can offer a varied curriculum to meet the needs of all the pupils.

Robert C. Taber, head of Pupil Personnel and Counseling in Philadelphia, said: "Schools are in a unique position to identify maladjustment early in the lives of children and to differentiate between 'growing pains' and the beginnings of a deep-seated emotional disturbance."[20]

Herbert Quay says that in his opinion the schools can be used to help prevent and control delinquency. He concluded: "Educators, especially classroom teachers, are the logical ones to observe deviant behavior."[21] A teacher can spot a predelinquent in such acts as repeated truancy, school failure and behavioral problems. However, in order to do this, a teacher must have good mental health himself and possess the ability to adjust to the strains of life. At one time 85 per cent of 1500 students referred to the St. Louis Diocescan reading clinic had developed emotional disturbances only after they had failed to learn to read.

Frank T. Flynn advanced still another possible cause of delinquency: "It is likely, though not proved, that a demoralization of our youth,

seen in its broadest terms, results from the continuous exposure to the spectacle of untrammelled sex and violence in our recreational media."[22][10] And a Senate Sub-Committee of 1955 reported that the American comics industry offers a "short course in murder, mayhem, robbery, rape, cannibalism, carnage, necrophilia, sex, sadism, masochism and virtually every other form of crime, bestiality and horror." While many claims are made about the effects of television, movies, comic books and the press in general on delinquency, some people feel that not enough valid research has been made to validate such claims. However, it would be natural to conclude that the increase of violence in our entertainment media, for example, must reflect itself in the action of our teen-agers, who attempt to be like grownups.

Moreover, modern youth reaches adolescence earlier than previous generations, yet law and custom postpone permission for adult sex behavior society used to curtail both opportunity and stimulation, but it now permits a tremendous pressure of sex-arousal and is progressively more tolerant of breaches of moral conduct among adults as well as juveniles.

Since the meaning of delinquency has been defined and some of the causes of juvenile delinquency studied, let us turn our attention to the treatment. The first Juvenile Court in the United States was established in Chicago (Cook County) in 1899 after it had been promoted by the great reformer, Jane Addams. The philosophy behind its founding was to remove the juvenile from the class of adult criminals he would be exposed to in regular criminal courts. The present criminal code in the United States says that children under the age

of 7 are incapable of crime; that if a child is 7 or over but under the age of 14, he must be placed under the dispostion of the juvenile court. If the offender is 14 but under 18 he can only be tried as an adult if the case has been referred to the appropriate authority; this is rarely used. Persons 18 and over are tried as adults. This establishment of a juvenile court assumes that at times and under certain conditions, it is necessary for the court to step in under the old doctrine of parens patriae and offer the child the care, guidance, and control he should have had under the care of his parents but which for some reason, he failed to recieve. In other words, this is the power of the state through the court to act in behalf of the child as a wise parent would.

A Juvenile Court judge in New York, Justine W. Polier, explained that the idea behind such a court is to give individualized justice to the youthful offender. She also felt that the court "recognizes the individuality of a child and adapts its orders accordingly," that it is a "legal tribunal where law and science, especially the science of medicine and those sciences which deal with human behavior, such as biology, sociology, and psychology, work side by side," and that its purpose is remedial. Its purpose is remedial and to a degree preventive, rather than punitive. However, great variation existed among the juvenile court judges in New York in their use of parole and remand, which means giving a child a temporary shelter care.[23]

The use of probation and parole are other measures of dealing with youthful offenders by the courts in addition to sentencing them to institutions. Probation does not convey the same meaning to everyone.

In a well staffed urban area, it could mean systematic selection of cases, with an attempt at diagnosis plus a planned and supervised parole. In the rural areas where no such setup is to be found, it might mean only some well meant warnings by the judge, but that no follow up whatsoever would be used. The word, parole, which comes from the French and is used as parole "honneur" or "work of honor" simply means that a person agrees to abide by certain regulations for his release into society. Another recourse used by the courts is detention, which means that a juvenile is confined in a private home or an institution while awaiting a final decision of the court to become a ward of the state. In a recent study of probation practices in Saginaw, Michigan, it was found that the use of wise and directed practices of probation cut their number of persons being sent to institutions by half. Moreover, it was discovered that it only costs about one tenth as much to have a person on probation as in an institution. But even with our more progressive methods of dealing with offenders, the recidivism, rate was shown to be 20 per cent in a recent three state survey and many authorities believe that nationwide it may be from 10 to 40 per cent.

Obviously, a problem with the magnitude of the one of juvenile delinquency should have some preventitive methods taken, so let us turn our attention to what some of these methods might be. Some anonymous writer has written the following instructions as a cure for juvenile delinquency, but as this study has shown, there is no one single cause for it, so there cannot be a single and simple answer. Therefore, this advice, if effective for anyone, would have application for only those teens from possibly a middle-class society or

above who simply are restless. It does, however, contain some excellent advice for the teen-ager who has no serious problems.

OPEN LETTER TO TEEN-AGERS

"Always we hear the plaintive cry of the teen-agers, 'What can we do? Where can we go?' Here are some suggestions:

GO HOME

Remove the storm windows. Paint the woodwork. Rake the leaves. Mow the lawn. Learn to cook. Scrub the floors. Repair the sink. Build a boat. Get a job. Help your pastor. Assist the poor. Study your lessons. And when you are through--and not too tired-- read a good book.

Your parents do not owe you entertainment. The world does not owe you a living. Your city does not owe you recreational facilities. You owe the world something. You owe it your time, energy, and your talents, so that no one will be at war, or in poverty, or sick, or lonely again.

In plain simple words: Grow up. Quit being a cry baby; get out of your dream world; develop a back bone, not a wishbone, and start acting like a man or lady.

You are supposed to be mature enough to accept some of the responsibility your parents have carried for you for years. They have nursed, protected, helped, appealed, begged, excused, and tolerated you and have denied themselves needed comforts. They have done this gladly, for you are their dearest treasure.

But now, you have no right to expect them to bow to

every whim and fancy of yours just because selfish ego, not common sense, dominates your personality, thinking, and requests. GROW UP AND GO HOME."

Anonymous

Work, as expressed in the foregoing advice, also has been suggested by others who feel that useful employment would help many of the delinquents. Dr. James Short, of the University of Chicago, remarked, "We're soft on work in this country. We pass child labor laws to keep kids out of dangerous jobs and then we overdo it to the point where there's little of anything for them to do." He is of the opinion that striving for status is one of the prime motives behind delinquency, and that the possession of a job would be beneficial in granting such status.[24] On the other hand, some of the labor union spokesmen have said that juvenile delinquency has not been aided by finding jobs for the boys. At the present time, the Job Corps has been organized with this very thought in mind, and only time will tell if it will be effective.

Bernice M. Moore offered these suggestions for combating juvenile delinquency: "Increase in parental respect for the law and teaching of such respect to their children; firmer control of children and youth by their parents; less 'coddling' of young hoodlums; more severe treatment for 'repeaters;' reformatories which will reform; control of comic books; well-trained policemen to work with youngsters on neighborhood beats."[25] Her findings seem to concur with the decision made at the 29th annual convention of the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol) where representatives of 63 nations agreed that much of the increase in juvenile delinquency throughout

the world is attributable to the general relaxation in the upbringing of young children.

Similar findings are reported by John E. Winters: "The most vivid lesson learned is that the roots of character are to be found in the home, in the parent-child relationship. Effective delinquency prevention must focus on the strengthening of family life in order that the chain of personality distortions which passes on from generation to generation of parents and children be broken. Prospective parents must be reached through preventive mental hygiene and education for the responsibilities of family life."[26]

Ian Suttie showed that the origins of anxiety are to be found in the disturbance of the early maternal love relationship. If this love is denied the child, he will suffer anxiety, and aggressiveness oftentimes which causes him to chose deviant behavior toward society later on. If a child has, on the other hand, had loving, accepting parents, he finds it much easier to adjust to society. According to Anthony Weaver, "It may be agreed that the love of both parents of an undemanding, consistent kind, that does for the child what he cannot do for himself, lays the foundations of his security."[27]

Another solution proposed to curb delinquency is the use of a curfew. Curfew is a law which prohibits children of a specified age to be on the streets after a certain hour. A curfew has two purposes: (1) to protect young people by preventing their exposure to detrimental influences, vice or immorality; and (2) to control and reduce juvenile delinquency in that the police could aid parents whose control of their own children is weak or who do not actually care where their children are hanging out. There are criticisms to the curfew law by some who

feel it emphasizes a negative approach and that it creates resentment in the youth against authority. Even the Children's Bureau has said that: "The most effective curfew is one applied by parents. It can be flexible to meet different circumstances, and children are more likely to obey it." But what about all those hosts of young people whose parents set no limitations on hours, companions, or habits?

One of the common complaints concerning teen-agers is that they tend to form into gangs, on the other hand, some social workers seem to feel that the gangs fill a need which the youngster has to find himself in this world. It has been found in at least one research project that youngsters are trying to become adults and so must establish their own identity, develop moral and religious standards, become free from their parents, choose a vocation and prepare for it and bring about a satisfactory relationship with the opposite sex. The easiest way in which these aims can be accomplished is by joining a gang where the need for acceptance and recognition can be fulfilled. In order to combat the evil forces of the gangs, workers with boys have been sent into some of the worst areas to deal with the anti-social teenage gangs. This is a difficult and oftentimes dangerous undertaking and results are not obtained easily. Here again all the experts are not in agreement on the value of gangs. Judge Jacob Panken of New York's Children's Court wrote: "Some juvenile authorities, including the New York City Youth Board, insist that the way to deal with these gangs is to 'infiltrate' them with social workers who endeavor, by subtle suggestion, to redirect their activities from within. Not only is this method costly and uncertain, but it also gives recognition and status to the gang and lawless acts on

which it is built.[28]

There are some juvenile delinquents who actually require shock treatment, surgery, and, occasionally, lobotomies or drugs, because in some way they are biologically deficient. Such irregularities would only show up if the youngster were given extensive medical examinations when brought into court.

At the present time a great deal is being written concerning the teenage subculture. Delinquent subcultures tend to follow three main patterns: criminal, conflict, and retreatest. The direction a subculture takes depends upon the opportunity structures which delinquent youth encounter for the pursuit of conventional goals, and their degree of integration with persons of older age levels. The criminal subculture contains those young people who resort to actual crime to survive as a gang. The conflict group resort to intergang conflict rather than the kinds of crime engaged in by the first group. And the third group, the retreatists, are the ones who get their kicks from narcotics or alcohol.[29]

But what makes a youngster want to join one of the gangs and start on the road to delinquency? In the 19th century, a sociologist, Emile Durkheim, advanced the concept of anomie, which means lawlessness, or normlessness. Anomie has its root in the word "anonymous", defined as "unknown" or "unavowed," according to Webster's Unabridged Dictionary. Durkheim thought that anomie resulted from a breakdown in the regulation of goals such that men's aspirations become unlimited. He concluded that unlimited aspirations create a constant pressure for deviant behavior—that is, for behavior that departs from social norms. "Anomie" thus refers to a state in which social norms no longer

control men's actions. It would appear that the Gluecks are saying the same thing in another way when they warn that the path to prevention lies in the home when they wrote: "It entails the structuring of integrated personality and wholesome character during the first few formative years of life; and this fortunately, is accomplished largely in the home...parents are to a great extent not only the bearers, but also the selective filters, of the general culture. The same is true of schoolteachers, with whom children spend much of their time during the most impressionable and formative stages of life. Thus, there is both realism and promise in taking more direct and specific steps to improve the under-the-roof culture in home and school."[30]

Other authorities do not feel that a juvenile subculture is necessarily a delinquent one, but tend to identify delinquency in some way with drift, which is existing somewhere between freedom and control. This is an area in which control has been loosened and on the far end of the scale, the young teenager is trying to gain independence around illegal action. The delinquent drifts somewhere between criminal and conventional action.

Discontinuity in cultural transmission is prominent when there is disorganization in those components of a society which encompass more than one generation. When this breakdown results in members of a juvenile generation communicating primarily with each other, they may develop a subculture differing in many respects from that of their elders; they may have different customs, different moral standards, and even a somewhat different language. When the behavior promoted in a juvenile subculture seriously offends the expectations of adults, it is referred to as a delinquent subculture.

It is imperative that the citizens of our country become aware of the problem of juvenile delinquency and their obligations toward elimination of it. Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, said; "The more we know about human behavior, the better we will be able to discharge responsibilities of probation, sentencing, and parole selection." Delinquency continues to be predominantly a male, urban, minority, property offense problem; however, rural delinquency rates are increasing and female delinquency has become a more frequent occurrence within the past five years. Moreover, in the words of W. David Wills, it is well to remember: "The unstable family is one of the distressing phenomena of our time and it is the unstable family which produces young offenders. It is something which every study of juvenile delinquency during the last half-century draws attention to, and which more recent studies have stressed more heavily."[31]

"Periodically, the public rises up in righteous indignation about the delinquency behavior of youth," says Taber. "But we can no longer do this in good conscience until we have fulfilled our responsibility to children by providing adequate services. It is high time we stop throwing brickbats at the younger generation and begin laying the bricks that will provide the solid foundation for a bulwark of facilities. Time is fasting running out."[32] But can we say we are doing our best, when, in the last decade, Americans spent $110 billion on new and used autos, $127 billion for recreation and $151 billion on cosmetics, alcohol and tobacco compared to $78 billion on public education in elementary and high schools?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Tunley, Roul, Kids, Crime and Chaos, New York, Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1962.
2. Ibid.
3. Tyvel, T. R., Troublemakers, New York, Schocken Books, 1962.
4. Tait, C. Downing, Jr., M.D. and Emory F. Hodges, Jr., M.D., Delinquents, Their Families and the Community, Springfield, Charles C. Thomas, 1962.
5. Ibid.
6. Quay, Herbert C., Editor, Juvenile Delinquency, Princeton, New Jersey, Toronto, New York, London, D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1965.
7. Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor, Delinquents in the Making, New York, Harper and Row, 1952.
8. Barron, Milton L., The Juvenile Delinquent in Society, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1954.
9. Amos, William E., Raymond L. Manella, and Marilyn A. Southwell, Action Programs for Delinquency Prevention, Springfield, Charles C. Thomas, 1965.
10. Tunley, op. cit.
11. Quay, op. cit.
12. Tunley, op. cit.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid.
21. Quay, op. cit.
22. Tyvel, op. cit.
23. Polier, Justine Wise, A View from the Bench, New York, Chicago, Austin, San Francisco, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1964.
24. Tunley, op. cit.
25. Moore, Bernice Milburn, Juvenile Delinquency, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1958.
26. Winters, John E., Crime and Kids, Springfield, Illinois, Charles C. Thomas, 1959.
27. Weaver, Anthony, They Steal for Love, New York, International Press, Inc., 1959.
28. Tunley, op. cit.
29. Cloward, Richard A., and Lloyd E. Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity, Glencoe, The Free Press of Glencoe, A division of the Crowell-Collier Publishing Co., 1961.
30. Glueck, op. cit.
31. Wills, W. David, Common Sense About Your Offenders, New York, The MacMillan Co., 1962.
32. Tunley, op. cit.